

# ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES IMPACT EVALUATION

DT2064 2003

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

1. Native American Tribe(s) have been notified of the project. Those tribes expressing an interest will be considered a consulting party.

Date Notified (M/DD/YY)	Expressed Interest (Y/N)	Native American Tribe
9/05/03		Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of Wisconsin
9/05/03		Forest County Potawatomi Community of Wisconsin
9/05/03	Yes	Ho-Chunk Nation
9/05/03		Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma
9/05/03	Yes	Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians
9/05/03		Lac du Flambeau Band of Lake Superior Chippewa
9/05/03		Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin
9/05/03		Minnesota Mdewakanton Sioux, Prairie Island Indian Community
9/05/03		Stockbridge Munsee Board of Mohican Indians
9/05/03		Oneida Nation
9/05/03		Red Cliff Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians
9/05/03		Sac & Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa
9/05/03		Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri
9/05/03		Sac & Fox Nation of Oklahoma
9/05/03	Yes	St. Croix Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians
9/05/03		Sokaogon (Mole Lake) Band of Chippewa Indians

Tribe	Issue	Date
Consultation: Ho-Chunk	Requested curation at MVAC	
St. Croix Band	Requested curation at MVAC	

2. Identify each site by alternative. Attach map to appendices depicting site(s) approximate location within alternate

Alternative (If applicable)	Site Name	Site #	Phase 2	Site Eligible for NHRP	Description & Pertinent Info on Site, e.g., historic, prehistoric, village, campsite, etc.	Site Affected	Effect
	Pullman	47 Sc-132	Not Required	No	Prehistoric campsite	No	No
	Rise	47 Sc-137	Not Required	No	Prehistoric campsite	No	No
	Krumm	47 Sc-136	Not Required	No	Prehistoric campsite	No	No
	Breault	47 Sc-131	Completed	Yes	Late Woodland campsite	No	No
	Cylon Graded School	47 Sc-135	Not Required	No	Historic Euro-American school	No	No
	Old Cody Farm	47 Sc-134	Not Required	No	Historic Euro-American farmstead	No	No
	Bazille	47 Sc-133	Not Required	No	Historic Cultural Material	No	No
	T&M	47 Sc-140	Not Required	No	Historic Euro-American farmstead	No	No
	Reed	47 Sc-139	Not Required	No	Prehistoric campsite	No	No

3. National Historic Landmark in project area? ☐ Yes, Name \_\_\_\_\_ ☒ No

4. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) in project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Type of TCP \_\_\_\_\_

Discuss consultation and explain the treatment/mitigation.

5. Sacred Sites in project area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss consultation and decisions reached. Attach documentation.

\_\_\_\_\_

6. Cemeteries in project area? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Name of cemetery(ies) Cylon (BSc-17), \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

- ☒ Documentation Attached

☒ Deed

☒ Cemetery Association

☒ Plat Map

☒ Other Sketch map of marked graves in relation to APE

- ☒ Consultation with Wisconsin Historical Society (Burials Sites Office & SHPO)

Dates March 1, 2006 \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Burials will not be affected.

☐ Burials will be affected.

☐ Documentation attached.

☐ Project may proceed.

7. Human Remains/Burials Reported or Encountered During Archaeological Studies

☐ Yes ☒ No If yes, ☐ Native American ☐ Euro-American

☐ Area avoided.

☐ Burials will not be affected.

☐ Burials left in place.

☐ Burials will be affected.

☐ Project may proceed.

☐ Consultation and dates

☐ Native Americans \_\_\_\_\_

☐ SHPO \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Burial Sites Office \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Permission to re-enter from Wisconsin Historical Society Director (date) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ All documentation attached

8. Do FHWA requirements for Section 4(f) apply to the project's use of the historic property?

☒ No

☐ Project is not Federally funded

☐ Property is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, will have no adverse effect.

☐ Other – Explain. \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Yes - Complete Factor Sheet O - Unique Area Impact Evaluation

☐ Project is eligible, will have adverse effect.

☐ Other, Explain. \_\_\_\_\_

9. Dates of Consultation

☒ SHPO March 1, 2006, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Native American August 2005, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

10. Has a Determination(s) of Eligibility (DOE) been prepared?

☐ No - Draft EIS-- Survey will be conducted on selected alternative and any DOE prepared will be documented in the Final EIS

☐ Yes ☐ No - EA- DOEs must be completed prior to the FONSI. When there are multiple alternatives, Phase 2 will be completed only on the preferred alternative.

☒ Yes – DOE prepared for:

Name of eligible sites: Breault (47 Sc-131), \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

11. Documentaion for Consultation

☐ Yes ☒ No

12. MOA prepared? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Signatories to MOA

- ☐ FHWA: Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Native American Tribe Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ WisDOT: Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ ACHP: Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

13. Data Recovery Plan

☐ Yes Date Accepted: \_\_\_\_\_

☒ No

Prepared by \_\_\_\_\_

14. Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) will participate in project ☐ Yes ☒ No

Date FHWA contacted ACHP \_\_\_\_\_

15. Public Interpretation Participants

NA, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_

16. Commitments to be included in contract specifications

Fence ROW at cemetery and Breault site, ;, engineers should provide WisDOT with revised metes and bounds for ROW in front of cemetery and WisDOT real estate should contact cemetery to confirm that they agree to confer ownership of ROW to WisDOT, WisDOT will provide St. Croix County register of deeds and Burial Sites Preservation Office with new metes and bounds.

# HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES OR UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS (USTs)

Wisconsin Department of Transportation  
DT2079 10/2004

Alternative <b>Ultimate Build-Out (stages 3, 2, and 1)</b>	Preferred <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Length of Center Line and Termini This Sheet is Evaluating <b>Not Applicable</b>	

- 1) Briefly describe the results of the Phase 1 hazardous materials assessment for this alternative. Do not use property identifiers (owner name, address or business name).

A Phase 1 Hazardous Materials Assessment was conducted along the majority of the project corridor. The portion of WIS 64 between US 63 and County Q was not included in the study area because no improvements are anticipated in this section. Nine sites of environmental concern were identified within approximately one-half mile of the project corridor. The sites of concern included six leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites, one environmental repair program (ERP) site, and two sites identified as active retail gasoline stations with registered underground storage tanks (USTs). No further action is required for five of the sites.

The remaining four sites of concern are all located near the intersection of WIS 64, US 63, and STH 46 and may require further investigation depending on required excavation depths at the intersection and the potential need to acquire right-of-way adjacent to the sites.

- 2) Which contaminants are known or suspected to be affecting sites on this alternative?

<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes, how many sites 4	Petroleum
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, how many sites	Hazardous Waste
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, how many sites	Closed Landfill Sites
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, how many sites	Open Landfill Sites
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, how many sites	Farm/Agricultural/Other Dump Sites
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, how many sites	Other

- 3) How many sites require further investigation? 4 sites may require investigation. This will depend on required excavation depths and right-of-way acquisition.

Were any sites not included in the Phase 1 assessment?

☒ No  
☐ Yes, how many

Why were they not reviewed?

## For the Preferred Alternative

- 4) Describe the results of any additional investigation (include number of sites investigated, level of investigation, and results for each site).

No investigation beyond the Phase 1 Assessment was performed.

- 5) Describe measures taken in selection of this alternative to avoid hazardous materials contamination for this project, for example: changes in location, changes in design, or relocation of utilities.

Various intersection improvements have been evaluated, with emphasis on a design that would minimize excavation adjacent to the contaminated sites and require no or minimal R/W acquisition. The roundabout intersection design appears to be the best choice for minimizing impacts.

- 6) For areas where contamination cannot be avoided by the proposed alternative, describe the remediation measures to be incorporated into the design, (e.g., waste handling plan, remediation of contamination, design changes to minimize disturbances).

This project is in the planning stage and is not proposed for construction until traffic volumes warrant the improvements. Multiple courses of action may be taken for the various sites of concern in the future, including design and location alterations or remediation. As design and construction approaches, these sites should be reevaluated to determine construction impacts and the current status of the hazardous materials issues identified.

The district will work with all concerned parties to insure that the disposition of any petroleum contamination is resolved to the satisfaction of the Wisconsin DNR, WisDOT BEES, and FHWA before acquisition of any questionable site, and before advertising the project for letting. Nonpetroleum sites will be handled on a case-by-case basis with detailed documentation and coordination with FHWA as needed.

# AESTHETICS IMPACT EVALUATION

DT2062 2003

Wisconsin Department of Transportation

Alternative Ultimate Build-Out (stages 3, 2, and 1)	Length of Center line and termini this sheet is evaluating if different from Sheet 1.  NA mi.
Preferred	
Yes	

1. Identify the alternative discussed on this sheet if it is different from the proposed action addressed in item 1 of Basic Sheet 1 or is different from the "Preferred Alternative" identified in item 3 of Basic Sheet 2.

Not Applicable.

2. Identify and briefly describe the visual character of the landscape. Include elements in the viewshed such as landforms, waterbodies, vegetation and human developments.

The visual character of the landscape in the WIS 64 corridor is primarily rural with cultivated fields covering rolling hills and occasional wooded parcels. The City of New Richmond (population 7,000) is located at the west end of the study corridor. At this end of the corridor there are commercial and agricultural-residential land uses. Between 145th and 170th Streets, north of the corridor, there is a U.S. Fish and Wildlife (FWS) Waterfowl Production Area (WPA) with wetland, lake, and wooded habitat. The majority of the rest of the corridor is farmland with occasional wooded areas and crossings of the Willow River and other streams.

3. Indicate the visual quality of the viewshed and identify landscape elements which would be visually sensitive.

The view shed from and to the project corridor is typical for this area of Wisconsin and Minnesota. That is, there are no features visible that might be considered as outstanding by locals or visitors. The rural nature of the project area (at this point in time) and the lack of significant visual vistas suggest a routine visual quotient.

4. Identify the viewers who will have a view of the improved transportation facility and those with a view from the improved transportation facility. Indicate the relative numbers (low, medium, high) of each group.

Businesses, residents, farmers, and drivers on roads crossing the facility would have a view of the improved transportation facility. In Segment 1, the eastern portion of the City of New Richmond would have a view of the facility. This view would be more visible in areas where a grade separation is proposed. Segments 2 and 3 are more rural in character so there would be relatively few viewers of the roadway.

Between 6,000 and 16,000 vehicles per day are anticipated to use WIS 64 and US 63 in 2032 throughout the corridor and would have a view from the improved roadway. This is a relatively high number of travelers that would have a view of the predominantly rural landscape from the roadway.

5. Indicate the relative time of day (morning, afternoon, evening, night) and the approximate amount of viewing time each viewer group would have each day.

The facility would be visible to users and observers at all hours of the day. There are no estimates of amount of viewing time for those observing the facility. Drivers would experience the longest exposure to the improved facility. Those crossing the facility would view it for much shorter periods of time.

6. Describe whether and how the project would affect the visual character of the landscape.

With the construction of the Preferred Alternative, the visual character of the landscape from the roadway is not anticipated to change significantly since the roadway will remain on-alignment. One change that will likely occur with or without the project is the development of highway-oriented commercial uses (as outlined in area planning and zoning). Construction of the divided highway may accelerate this development. One consideration is that at this time it is difficult to anticipate the visual character of the area in the future. The project will not be constructed for some time and significant growth is anticipated for this area of St. Croix County.

7. Indicate the effects the project would have on the viewer groups.

In the majority of the project area, the construction of the proposed alternative would have little effect on the viewer groups, since it remains generally on-alignment. WIS 64 will have similar characteristics to what exists today and

should not greatly interfere with the rural landscape. Adjacent residents, farms, and businesses may see the roadway somewhat closer depending on where the new lanes are constructed relative to the existing corridor. Changes in roadway elevation associated with grade-separated crossings will make the roadway more visible for some viewer groups. Additionally, the local roadway network will be enhanced in Stage 3, such as with local service roads. These new roadways will affect the landscape for local residents, farmers, and businesses, and these roads may occasionally be visible from the roadway. Generally, travelers on WIS 64 will continue to see a rural landscape.

8. Identify and discuss reasonable mitigation measures to avoid or minimize adverse visual effects or enhance positive aesthetic effects of the project.

Keeping the majority of the WIS 64 corridor on or very close to the existing alignment minimizes adverse visual effects of the project when it is constructed. In short, areas where the highway shifts off-alignment, it is generally done to protect wetland and other natural areas or minimize relocations that would otherwise be needed because of restricted land access.